Serial No: 10/552,548

Response to Office Action mailed June 3, 2011

<u>REMARKS</u>

Status of the Claims

Claims 1 and 3-14 were pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected.

Claims 3 - 6 stand objected to.

Claims 8-14 stand allowed.

Claim 1 is cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 3 – 7 are amended herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicant gratefully acknowledges Examiner's indication of allowability of claims

3-6 if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 3-6 have been amended to be independent

in form. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from amended independent claim 3.

Applicant submits that these amendments place the application in condition for

allowance. Therefore, entry of the accompanying amendments is respectfully

requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-6 stand objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

{00064167;v1} -7-

Serial No: 10/552,548

Response to Office Action mailed June 3, 2011

base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 3-6, having been amended in

independent form including the limitations of base claim 1, these objections are deemed

moot. Allowance of present claims 3-6 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent

3,151,379 to Escoffery (hereinafter "Escoffery"). Claim 1 has been cancelled without

prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 1

moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 1 is

respectfully requested.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Escoffery in view of U.S.

Patent No. 5,431,127 to Stevens. Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 3

and is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence from an allowable base claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 7 is

respectfully requested.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the

absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement

with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the

arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability

of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally,

nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard

to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any

-8-

{00064167;v1}

Serial No: 10/552,548 Response to Office Action mailed June 3, 2011

claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

{00064167;v1}

-9-

Serial No: 10/552,548

Response to Office Action mailed June 3, 2011

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes they have addressed all outstanding grounds raised by the

Examiner and respectfully submits the present case is in condition for allowance, early

notification of which is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any questions or outstanding matters, the Examiner is cordially

invited and requested to contact Applicant's undersigned Attorney at the number listed

below.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Edward J. Howard/

Edward J. Howard Registration No. 42,670 Howard IP Law Group, P.C. P.O. Box 226 Fort Washington PA, 19034-0226

Tel: (215) 542-5824

Fax: (215) 542-5825

Date: August 3, 2011

{00064167;v1} -10-